DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 619 HE 018 500

AUTHOR Reid, John Y.
TITLE Politics, Quality, and Passion: A Case Study of Reorganization in Higher Education. ASHE 1985 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Chicago, IL, March 15-17, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Advisory Committees; Departments; Higher Education; *Organizational Change; Policy Formation; *Political Influences; Power Structure; *School Organization; *Schools of Education; Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *University of Toledo OH

ABSTRACT

The reorganization of the College of Education and Allied Professions at the University of Toledo is discussed. The analysis is based on Baldridge's political model, Bacharach and Lawler's views of politics and power, Pirsig's concept of quality, and the Oxford English Dictionary definitions of "passion." To investigate the administrative and committee organization of the college, the college's new dean created an organization study committee, which included one representative from the college's 14 departments. The committee considered various organizational issues, including: the number of administrators and their responsibilities; the blurring between appropriate faculty and administrative functions; the overlapping of administrative functions (e.g., between departments and divisions); and the academic role of departments. In analyzing the role and influence of the committee, attention is directed to several important issues: ideological differences between theoretical and applied academic areas, or between disciplines; the process of articulating interests to the dean; the translation of interests into policies; the difference between authority and influence; the implementation of new administrative and committee structures; and the effects of organizational change on faculty. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259619

Politics, Quality, and Passion: A Case Study of Reorganization in Higher Education

John Y. Reid
Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Toledo

Prepared for

The Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois
March 17, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Y. Reid

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 018 500

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 15-17, 1985. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

INTRODUCTION

Education commands the attention of the American people these days. So great has interest been in topics educational, they have even become staples of network evening news. Funding, student competencies, tests, teacher standards, instruction by computer, governance, articulation, SAT scores, ethics, and a myriad of other issues have strutted in the sudden glare of publicity. This spotlighting alone -- like so many other topics education is at the mercy of media and political faddists -- likely would not have effected much change. However, the combination of public spotlighting and real, significant changes in demographics and public attitudes toward education has been enough to move at least a few institutions, at different levels, off comfortable dead center. In more cases, a unit within an institution has fought its own particular, and the institution's general inertia in attempting to accomodate change.

I tell in this paper, the story of one attempt to budge a unit of a complex university out of its settled past into a future of questionnable promise. It is the story of the reorganization of the College of Education and Allied Professions of The University of Toledo. First, though, a word about related literature and a brief discussion of the theoretical framework which will shape the analysis of the case.

LITERATURE

A recent bibliographic research report, Nordvall's (1932) The Process of Change In Higher Education Institutions, indicates that there is a wide range of professional literature on change in higher education. One volume in particular, Hipps' (1982) Effective Planned Change Strategies, contains a series of essays which cover many of the most important topics under the rubric "change in higher education." For the sake of clarity, it is fair to organize the substantial literature into five categories.

First are books that contain general discussions of change in higher education; Evans' (1967) Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education and Zaltman's (1973) Processes and Phenomena of Social Change exemplify this group. Second, articles such as Ingram's (1978) "The Policies of Policy Implementation" and Hartman's (1977) "Change and Conflict in the University" are best characterized as think pieces. These pieces generally are more sharply focused on a particluar aspect of the change process than is true of the general works in the first category. Third, "Overcoming Resistance to Change," by Coch and French (1948), and "Duration of Innovation in Educational Psychology," by Charles (1980), illustrate a number of works that have a pronounced psychological or human relations orientation. Fourth, the prescriptions of Chickering et al (1977) in Developing the College Curriculum and Lawton and Lawton (1979) in "An Autocatylitic Model for the Diffusion Educational Innovations" offer the reader cookbook analyses of the change process. Case studies, the subject of the fifth category, form a relatively small group, of which Alexander's (1982) "Case Study: The Wichita State University Experience" and Hansen's (1979) "Planning Through a Decentralized Process Case Study: University of Wisconson-Stout are typical.

While it is profuse, the literature on change in higher education is, for the most part, static and bloodless. Much of the work dances timidly around the central issue of how change really occurs. An article like Ryan's (1976) "Administrative Control in Academic Departments and Response to Reorganization" must be labeled "superficial" because it does not take into meaningful account the people who inhabited the fifteen academic departments at The Ohio State University that were subject to reorganization.

To be sure, there is not a total lack of awareness of the importance of human idioscyncrasies in the change process. Wideen and Holborn's (1984) study of ten faculties of education in Anglophone Canada, "Program and Organizational Change in Faculties of Education: Some Lessons for Survival" provides evidence of the authors' awareness of the crucial role human foibles play: "... a serious failing in higher education. That is, we have assumed that structural change will lead to actual change in the way the essential functions of the institution are carried out. This does not appear to occur, as problems, habits and traditional ways of doing things persist despite change in structure" (pp. 3-4).

The fact remains, however that the writings about change in institutions of higher education contain, almost exclusively, "theoretical models of the change process and practical advice about how to orchestrate that process successfully" (Nordvall, p. 1). The literature on change in higher education is static and bloodless for the reason suggested by Keller (1984) in a recent criticism of social science research in general and of strategic planning in particular:

> The social disciplines study people in action, not molecules. And people have passions, deep resentments, powerful longings, and touching needs as well as ideas and analytical reason. Anyone who has attempted to practice strategic planning and decision making is confronted with many reminders of this. Beyond strategic planning -- and underneath strategic planning - is a volcanic world of people's fears and hopes. Strategic planning needs [to] incorporate this fact more prominently in its work. So does anyone who does research in higher education. (p. 9)

FRAMEWORK AND DEFINITIONS

The overarching framework for my analysis of reorganization in The University of Toledo's College of Education and Allied Professions is the political model described (1971) and later modified (1978) by J. Victor Baldridge. While the early version of the model is flawed by underestimates of the impact of routine bureaucratic processes, of the role of environmental

factors, and of the way institutional structure and long-term patterns of decision-making shape and channel political efforts, the essential features, in a useful way, can shape a case study. The framework provided by Baldridge's political model is complemented by Bacharach and Lawler's (1980) discussion of politics and power, by Pirsig's (1974) concept of quality, and by Oxford English Dictionary definitions of "passion."

Baldridge's original model has five points of analyses: social structure or context, interest articulation processes, legislative transformation, policy outcomes, and policy execution. Baldridge (1971) says the about the points of analysis:

Social structure is "a configuration of social groups with basically different life-styles and political interests. The crucial point is that the differences often lead to conflict, for what is in the interest of one group may damage another" (p. 23).

The articulation of interests by each of the participant groups makes up the second stage of the model. Baldridge says, "Groups with conflicting values and goals must somehow translate them into effective influence if they are to obtain favorable action by legislative bodies" (p. 23).

The "dynamics by which articulated interests are translated into policies" constitutes the legislative stage. At this point, "claims are played off against one another, negotiations are undertaken . . . committees meet . . . and powerful poeple 'higgle and haggle' about the eventual policy" (pp. 23-24).

The successful completion of the legislative stage should lead to policy formulation. This is "the official climax to the conflict and represents an authoritative, binding decision to commit the organization to one set of possible alternative actions, to one set of goals and values" (p. 24).

Finally, policy must be implemented. In some cases implementation is routine; in others, attempts to implement policy result in a new round of interest articulation, or the groups involved in the process "feed back" their interests and concerns into a revised implementation process.

Baldridge (1971) develops his political model and compares selected aspects to the same aspects of bureaucratic and collegial models. Differences between and among the models in terms of two aspects have important implications for the current study: the view of decision making, and goal setting and policy.

First, decision making is viewed as a matter of negotiation, bargaining, and political influence processes in a political model. A bureaucratic model suggests that decision making is a rational process constrained by formal bureaucratic procedures. A collegial model posits that decision making involves shared, collegial decisions.

Second, political models place the emphasis of goal setting and policy on formulation, but in a bureaucratic scheme the emphasis is on execution. The emphasis on goal setting and policy formulation in a collegial model is unclear, but Baldridge (1971) suggests there is "probably more emphasis on formulation" (p. 25). In my analysis of reorganization in the College of Education and Allied Professions, I use these aspects of Baldridge's political model and employ the following operational definitions.

Politics

Bacharach and Lawler (1980) predicate their work "on the assumption that organizational life is dominated by political interactions; politics in organizations involve the tactical use of power to retain or obtain control of real or symbolic resources." Organizations like corporations, universities, and voluntary associations are "politically negotiated orders" in which actors constantly bargain and avail themselves of influence tactics, for "survival in an organization is a political act" (p. 1).

Power

Bacharach and Lawler (1980) state that power is a complex concept which "sensitizes us to certain forms and contents in a social relationship" (p. 14). They say the following about the form of power:

> Power must be embedded in the social relationship and not treated as an attribute of a single person, group, or organization. The relationship can and should be portrayed in terms of dependence. The patterns and degree of dependence are the basic parameters or context within which actors affect one another. Within the dependence relationship, actors confront the issue of when to use sanctions and whether sanctions will be effective with respect to the other party. (p. 26)

The same authors identify two content dimensions of power: authority and influence. They describe seven points of contrast between authority and influence, three of which are particularly useful in my analysis of institttuional reorganization:

1. Authority is the static, structural aspect of power in organizations; influence is the dynamic, tactical element.

2. Authority refers to the formally sanctioned right to make final decisions; influence is not sanctioned by the organization and is, therefore, not a matter of organizational rights.

3. Authority is circumscribed, that is, the domain, scope, and legitimacy of the power are specifically and clearly delimited; influence is uncircumscribed, that is, its domain, scope, and legitimacy are typically ambiguous. (p. 44)

Quality

Like power, quality is a complex notion which at its heart concerns individuals and the values they attirbute to acts and aspects of reality. Pirsig (1974) points out that it is an irritating, even angering concept, for while it begs precise definition, it must be accounted for in any complete analysis of human action. Quality is to reality what influence is to power: the dynamic subjective element which necessarily complements objectivity, or in the case of power, which complements authority. When one takes quality into account, the following occurs:

> Reality isn't static anymore. It's not a set of ideas you have to either fight or resign yourself to. It's made up, in part, of ideas that are expected to grow as you grow, and as we all grow, century after century. With Quality as a central undefined term, reality is, in its essential nature, not static but dynamic. And when you really understand dynamic reality you never get stuck. It has forms but the forms are capable of change. (Pirsig, p. 277)

Pirsig claims that most people forget about quality--just leave it hanging suspended--for they get nowhere when they try to trap it in definition: "Quality . . . you know what it is, yet you don't know what it is. But that's self-contradictory. But some things are better than others, that is, they have more quality" (p. 178).

While difficult to define, quality in human processes clearly is related to the purposes, emotions, and values of the people involved. Patton (1975) writes, "Men have purposes and emotions, they make plans, construct cultures, and hold certain values, and their behavior is influenced by such values, plans, and purposes" (p. 7). He also makes the important point that "a human being lives in a world which has 'meaning' to him, and, because his behavior has meaning, human actions are intelligible in ways that the behavior of nonhuman objects is not" (p. 7). Quality, in this context, must be an important consideration in the structuring and analysis of human processes like institutional reorganization, for it is quality which infuses human behavior with standards and direction. Quality is ignored at the risk of desiccating both the process and the analysis.

Passion

Passion is "Any kind of feeling by which the mind is powerfully affected or moved; a vehement or overpowering emotion; in psychology and art, any mode in which the mind is affected or acted upon (whether vehemently or not), as ambition, avarice, desire, hope, fear, love, hatred, joy, grief, anger, revenge. Sometimes personified. ...

1843 Prescott Mexico vi viii. (1964) It was as easy to curb the hurricane in its fury, as the passion of an infuriated hord of savages.

b. Without article or pl.: Commanding, vehement, or overpowering feeling or emotion.

1770 Wesley Lett., to F. Benson 5 Oct., Passion and prejudice govern the world. 1901 H. Black Culture and Restraint iv. 106 Philosophy is a feeble antagonist before passion.

c. A fit or moood marked by stress or feeling or abandonment to emotion; a transport of excited feeling; an outburst of feeling.

1354 Milman Lat. Chr. vii. ii (1864) iv.93 Henry fell on his knees and in a passion of grief entreated her merciful interference. 1856 W. Collins After Dark (1862) 214. She burst into a hysterical passion of weeping.
(Compact Edition of The Oxford English Dictionary Volume II, p. 533)

CASE STUDY

Background

A new era dawned in September of 1983 at The University of Toledo. For the first time in more than a quarter of a century, the College of Education had a new dean. (Two years earlier, the college had been renamed College of Education and Allied professions in recognition of an expanded mission.) George Edmund Dickson, an Ohio State associate professor who in 1957 had come to Toledo as dean, had retired. The mantle of office had passed to Philip Joel Rusche, the former education dean at West Virginia's Marshall University. Phil Rusche seized the opportunity the vacancy in the established Toledo program presented, relieved, no doubt, to be free of the enervation resulting from Marshall's uncertain funding position vis-a-vis the flagship University of West Virginia.

The shadow cast by Ed Dickson was long, the legacy in ways oppressive. (To this day, some faculty members have to think twice about what "the College of Ed" really means.) Nevertheless, bouyed by a generally optimistic outlook and a habit of looking forward rather than backward, the new dean spent some

five months getting acclimated, meeting all the members of the faculty and staff -- some several times, and evaluating the college in terms of nagging, unresolved issues. Toward the latter end, he had the Faculty-Administration Liaison Committee poll the faculty about issues of concern. The rank order of the five most important issues was as follows: faculty loads and departmental staffing; criteria and their weight in faculty evaluation; consideration of a restructuring of college administration (e.g., divisions, departments, deans, and their roles); role of participants in the process of faculty evaluation; and student recruitment. Despite the facts that the survey had but a 50% response rate and that no issue was identified as needing "immediate attention" by more than a third of the college's total faculty, the dean attributed great significance to the results. Simply by being mentioned, even if only by a few people, survey items came to be identified as issues and considered to be problems. On the basis of the list generated by the liaison committee, Rusche developed six categories for discussion: staff, students, physical facilities, curriculum development, organizational structure, business and finance, and school/community relations.

The new dean wanted to resolve the "issues" as quickly as possible, to put old worries behind, in order to free the faculty to explore new possibilities. However, when he thought none of the college's seventeen standing committees was willing to accept responsibility for finding solutions to any of forty issues, he knew clearly that the college had fundamental organizational problems. Not only were the committees unwilling to get involved, none of the thirty-three (out of 100 full-time) faculty members with some sort of administrative title appeared willing to accept any of the issues as their particular responsibility. Therefore, faced with what he considered to be a paralyzing backlog of concerns embedded in personal histories, old wounds, and degrees of passion, Rusche

created an Organization Study Committee, which was charged with studying the administrative organization and committee organization of the college. Pressure from the vice president for academic affiars to run the college more efficiently strengthened the dean's resolve to examine the workings of the college.

Process

When the dean asked me to chair the Organization Study Committee, which was comprised of one elected representative from each of the college's fourteen departments and the director of student field experiences, I willingly accepted. I had long thought that the college's redundant administrative layers and failure to hold people accountable for many key responsibilities was symptomatic of an organizational inefficiency extreme even by higher education standards. To be part of an attempt to study the operation, at the behest of a dean determined to relieve pressure in a badly clogged system, was welcome, indeed.

The committee met for the first time in late January of 1984. Its composition was representative of the most important divisions within the college: old guard, young Turks; true believers from teacher education, educational foundations, the allied professions (i.e., health, physical, and recreational education), and administration; and those with a lot at stake financially and those with little at stake financially. During the course of the committee's work, there was a constant struggle against the parochialism and narrow self-interest that had layered like plaque over the last years of the former dean's regime.

The complacency and sense of "stuckness" that characterized the education faculty can be attributed to a combination of causes:

1. Colleges of education everywhere were under seige, from within and without the institutions.

2. The comptency-based teacher education program, which had been entrenched for twelve years, was jealousy guarded by a small, powerful group which had been largely responsible for its implementation. Although the program enjoyed a very good reputation in some circles, and while some changes within the basic program had been made over time, a large number of faculty members questioned both its practicality and validity.
3. The current administrative structures had not changed to reflect new realities but had remained virtually static for thirteen years.
4. The former dean had spent much of his last four years away from the college, which left a leadership void filled with the divided energies of three associate deans, who did not share a common vision of the college's future.

The fact that the dean had asked me to chair the committee before the first meeting signaled that it was his advisory committee and that he intended to work closley with the group to insure that it kept focused on its charge. He had been in the college long enough to appreciate how easily gentle collegiality could be compromised by factional force. From the beginning, Rusche made it clear that the final decisions about administrative and committee organization were his alone to make; at the same time, he gave the committee the impression that its recommendations would weigh heavily. Also, in the beginning, the committee assumed that it would be the body through which individual faculty member's and department's pleas and plans would filter and that the committee's synthesis of this information would be transmitted to the dean.

During the first committee meeting, Rusche discussed his view of organizations and their functions. He stressed his concern about being creative

and adopting to change by looking at how college goals could be achieved effectively and efficiently. The dean's overview served two important functions; it provided committee members with a vocabulary they could use in discussing organizational issues and let the members understand the dean's personal perspective and theory of organizations. Rusche told the committee that he expected a report in ten weeks; if the committee could not produce recommendations by then, the dean indicated he would go forward, nevertheless, and make changes if he deemed them necessary.

Three sets of data were to inform the committee's deliberations: organizational charts and information about any recent reorganization from peer institutions; job descriptions from college personnel with administrative titles; and suggestions from individual faculty members. Suggestions from the departments were to be gathered by the committee members and brought to the committee for consideration.

The second committee meeting took place one week after the first. On that occasion, the group identified six key organizational issues:

1. The number of administrators and the tasks they perform;
2. the blurring between appropriate faculty and administrative functions;
3. the overlapping of administrative functions (e.g., between departments and divisions);
4. the academic role of departments;
5. the relationship between functions performed by heads of units (i.e., departments, divisions, and centers) and those performed by deans; and
6. the problem of "turf," as exemplified by the difficulty in assigning student credit hour and faculty load credit when a person from one department taught a course for another department.* (February 3, 1985)

*The fourteen departments, each with a chairman, were organized in four divisions, each with a director. The divisions, not the departments, were the budgetary units.

During the second meeting, the committee decided to table a suggestion to have either the university's president or vice president for academic affairs discuss how they saw the college fitting into the overall university structure. This wider perspective was never sought, which is not surprising given the university's habit of using the phrase "unit autonomy" to excuse the failure to generate any comprehensive academic plan for the institution. The committee simply did not not believe that the views of either the president or vice president could contribute to the working out of the college's problems. Near the end of the second meeting, I appointed a subcommittee which was to draw up a list of managerial functions. This list was to form the basis of discussion at our next meeting.

The third meeting opened with a discussion of managerial functions. The wandering conversation was followed by a presentation by the dean, in which he gave a theoretical overview of administrative task areas that needed to be addressed and then offered detailed versions of possible administrative and committee structures. The dean made it clear that his designs were just one of a number he could find appealing, and he emphasized that the committee should be flexible and invite suggestions from various sources.

In the name of efficiency, the group ended the third meeting by dividing the committee into two subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Organization and the Subcommittee on Committee Structure. Drafts of recommendations from the two were to be distributed to the full committee for discussion in early March, which would mark the half way point in the ten weeks allotted for the task.

During February, the two subcommittees consulted various individuals and constituencies in preparing the draft reports. As a part of that process, the dean agreed to meet with each of the groups to discuss their emerging ideas and to indicate what he would and would not be comfortable with.

The details of the report of the Subcommittee on Organization followed from these principles:

1. It would be desirable to flatten the structure.

2. No department would be split or fragmented in order to bring new departments into existence. The subcommittee acknowledged that changes of faculty members to new or different alliances might occur later in the organizational process.

3. Attention should be given to effective working relationships, as well as to academic and philosophical compatibilities.

4. Any suggested changes would solve some problems while posing new ones. (9 March 1984)

In turn, the Subcommittee on Committee Structure announced these principles:

> The College of Education and Allied Professions will operate under a collegial system of interactive decision-making. The dynamics of such an organization are reflected in its committee structure.
>
> The current standing committees do not meet the comprehensive needs of the college. Further, decision-making and policy recommendations are sometimes cumbersome because of unclear jurisdiction or the absence of an appropriate committee to which to refer a specific issue. The new committee structure, with five comprehensive standing committees and one standing sub-committee, complements the college's new organizational structure. The structure consolidates the current myriad of committees and assures that there is a standing committee to address all areas of college activities. (9 March 1984)

The reports were discussed by the full committee, and the dean, in turn, was asked to provide a diagram of his preferred structure. That plan, the topic of a March 16 meeting, kept in tact the principles of both subcommittee reports, although the department alignment suggested by the dean differed from that put forth by the organization subcommittee.

During the next month, I worked with four members of the committee on formulating rationales for the new administrative and committee structures. In that same period, groups of faculty members met, usually by department, to discuss the plan.

The proposed administrative organization and the proposed committee structure were explained to the college faculty by the dean at a special

meeting on April 20. At the end of the meeting, he called for a secret ballot vote to indicate support of the proposal. The 90% favorable vote was recorded on April 25.

The dean sent the organizational study report, with department titles and the names of department chairs, to the president and vice president for academic affairs. Following a summer delay, the Board of Trustees approved the plan in the fall of 1984.

Analysis

There is little doubt that many members of the college's faculty could have lived quite happily with no change. Despite the implementation of new organizational structures, faculty members generally have gone about their business as usual during the six months that have expired since formal adoption of the new scheme. There have been no significant academic program initiatives; there have been no new research agendas; and there has been no marked change in the alignment of faculty groups or of the communication patterns in and among them. Baldridge's framework helps us understand "what happened."

It is no secret that colleges and universities epitomize configurations of social groups "with basically different life-styles and political interests" (Baldridge (1971, p. 23). More important, faculty groups often have fundamentally different conceptions and understandings of reality. These differences are characterized by Mitroff and Kilman (1978) in the distinction between the "analytic scientist" and the "conceptual theorist." Mitroff and Kilman paraphrase the analytic scientist's argument this way:

> "To know" is to be certain about something. Certainty is defined by the ability to "phrase" or enumerate the components of an object, event, person, or situation in a precise, accurate, and reliable fashion. Therefore, knowledge is synonymous with precision, accuracy, and reliability. Any endeavor that cannot be subjected to

> this formula or line of reasoning is either suppressed, devalued, or set aside as not worth knowing or ... doing. (p. 33)

This group is opposed by conceptual theorists, who are described in these terms:

> The CT [conceptual theorist] believes that practice must be treated holistically and conceptually. Instead of there being a single, all-embracing, precise, internally self-consistent paradigm to treat all of nature's diverse phenomena, the CT believes that one must have recourse to many explicitly conflicting paradigms. (p. 55)

Clearly, ideological differences which exist between theoretical and applied academic areas, or those which exist between disciplines, hamper joint action. True believers may have their view of the world so fixed by a particular paradigm as to make any meaningful communication impossible. Ideological differences make joint faculty action difficult in colleges during the best of times. In the worst of times, marked by depressing demographics and sorry economic circumstances, such differences are highlighted.

The social structure of the College of Education and Allied Professions remains complex and under myriad stresses, as was the case during the reorganization process. Among the faculty could be found the fundamental ideological and intellectual differences suggested by Mitroff and Kilman. To these were added economic divisions, in most cases along age lines; program divisions, particularly between teacher education adherents and the allied professions faction; and a division between administrators and faculty members. All these combined to create an atmosphere which was not conducive to cooperative action on an issue which demanded wide participation.*

Baldridge's second point of analysis is the process of interest articulation. In the present case, this was the crucial stage. Politics and

*I distinguish between "real, genuine, concerned participation" and the participation of "going through the motions."

passion became the prime motivators in the process, despite the consistent effort of some to keep the quality of the college, in terms of the professional lives of faculty members and the education of students, at the heart of the action.

"Thinking should become the process by which our desires find a more meaningful and unified manner of expression," said W. D. Armentrout some forty-four years ago (p. 364). Unhappily, the first rumors about the formation of an organization study committee generally stimulated not thinking, but either apprehension, complemented by a passionate defense of the status quo, or a feeling of quiet optimism, tempered by resignation. The passionate defense of the status quo came from those who perceived they had a lot to lose through change; resignation came from those skeptical about the amount of creativity and change that could be tolerated by a faculty not used to the freedom, as well as the stress, of decision-making. For years, the administration of the college had been authoritarian, despite the existence of titles and structures that gave the appearance of diffused authority.

The dean consistently said that he wanted the Organization Study Committee to gather suggestions and to provide him with recommendations that reflected a synthesis of ideas that looked to the future not to the past. However, this process was seriously compromised for two reasons. First, some committee members acted as if they had been elected to the committee in order to advance the special interests of individual departments, rather than to be part of a common quest to transcend parochialism for a common good. Second, while the dean stated that the committee was to be the main vehicle for gathering data and sorting opinions, he accepted a steady stream of supplications, which were delivered in person or on paper. Many of the most passionate and politically astute among the faculty came to realize that as long as the dean

was willing to hear them, it made sense to circumvent a committee that would work their ideas in with competing others.

After six weeks or so, the committee began to believe that certain people "had the ear" of the dean and that their individual voices were carrying more weight than the homogenized voice of the committee. A feeling that the role of the committee was circumscribed had flared at the meeting of February 10 when Rusche presented, in detail, his possible design for reorganization. While one can only guess about how flexible the dean intended to be in terms of modifying his initial plan or about the degree to which its presentation was just a device to focus the committee's energies, to different degrees committee members feared the worst. Most felt that some rather firm decisions already had been made by the dean, with the help of unseen individuals, and that the committee's work, to a worrisome extent, was pro forma.

I have mentioned the legacy of the former dean. He was a strong, authoritarian leader, who more than once had made preemptory decisions, despite the existence of committees charged with resolving certain issues. Although the individuals on the Organization Study Committee liked the new dean as a person, they were suspicious enough of the office of the dean to react negatively at the first sign of behavioral echoes from the former era.

When suspicions about motives in the office of the dean were complemented by a growing belief that the committee was just one among many sources of influence in a decision that would be made by the dean, the process of interest articulation became much less rational than anyone had originally intended. During February and March, the dean was bombarded by information, and in committee meetings a lot of time was spent guessing about appropriate reactions to what one member or another had heard had been said to the dean by a particular individual. The general confusion and loss of confidence in the committee process ensured that considerations about the quality of an integrated academic

program marked by intellectual openness and daring, took a distant third to politics and passion, which fought for the lead.

The legislative stage is the point at which interests are translated into policies. In this case, claims were "played off against one another"; a committee did meet; a commission (i.e., the committee) did report; negotiators (i.e., committee members) did bargain; and "powerful people" did "higgle and haggle" about the eventual policy, as Baldridge (1971) suggests they must. However, all the claims were never played off against one another in committee meetings; only the dean was privy to all the claims. Also, while committee members negotiated, and while some powerful people "higgled and haggled" through the committee process, I have pointed out that much was taking place outside the committee. That this should occur is not unusual, but in this case it did result in a breakdown of trust. The committee came not to trust its influence, or, to put it another way, the committee increasingly wondered if its report would make much difference.

The successful completion of the legislative stage should lead to policy formulation. In the College of Education and Allied Professions, the plan presented by the dean, supported by a faculty vote, and approved by the Board of Trustees, did represent "an authoritative, binding decision to commit the organization to one set of possible alternative actions." However, the fact that "one set of possible alternative actions" was adopted by duly constituted authorities does not mean that college was necessarily committed to "one set of goals and values," as Baldridge (1971) suggests should be the case (pp. 23-24). The dean and the board acted with authority, which "refers to the formally sanctioned right to make find decisions" (Bacharach and Lawler, p. 44). In higher education institutions, however, it is influence, not authority, which for the most part truly legitimates goals and values. Influence "is

not sanctioned by the organization and is, therefore, not a matter of organizational rights" (Bacharach and Lawler, p. 44). The crucial difference between authority and influence accounts for the fact that the college still lacks consensus about goals and values, despite the implementation of an authoritative organizational plan.

Policy implementation is the final stage of the Baldridge model. So far, the implementation of the new policy (i.e., new administrative and committee structures) has gone reasonably smoothly. New department chairs and new standing committees function, and there are no more blatant antagonisms or warring factions among the faculty than there were before reorganization. A number of the untreated problems that originally piqued the dean's ire and forced the issue of reorganization have been solved or are under study. The dean enjoys the good will of most faculty members, and people somehow seem a bit friendlier then before. These might be considered good signs.

There are, however, unanswered questions of great magnitude. Can the individual faculty members learn to trust one another intellectually to a degree that will enable them to look at academic program and research options without prejudice? Without such trust, program development will proceed incrementally, as in the past, with considerations of institutional expediency and politics weighing more heavily than considerations of educational quality.

Can the faculty learn to appreciate the opportunities, rather than to fear the uncertainties, presented by change? Can the faculty internalize and then be catalzyed by an understanding of the difference between "reorganized," a static concept, and "reorganizing," an active concept? The answers to these questions about accomodation to change and about stasis and activity lie at the heart of the issue of quality. Unless the process of organizational change which has begun includes a change in the mind set of the participants,

the reorganization will have been a mere exercise in bureaucratic efficiency, spurred by institutional politics and a bit of passion.

REFERENCES

Alexander, David R. "Case Study: The Wichita State University Experience." In Effective Planned Change Strategies, edited by G. Melvin Hipps. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 33. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Armentrout, W. D. "Neglected Values in Higher Education: Needed Reorganization in Curriculum and Extra-Curricular Activities to Provide Significant Experiences." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 12, No. 3 (March 1941): 137-42.

Bacharach, Samuel B. and Lawler, Edward J. Power and Politics in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor; Curtis, David V.; Ecker, George; and Riley, Gary L. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Charles, D. C. "Duration of Innovation in Educational Psychology." Educational Psychologist 15 (Fall 1980): 159-63.

Chickering, Arthur W.; Halliburton, David; Berguist, William H.; and Lindquist, Jack. Developing the College Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Coch, Lester and French, John R. P., Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations, 1 (1948): 512-32.

Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary Volume II. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Evans, Richard I. Resistance to Innovation in Higher Eduation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Hansen, Valerie R. "Planning Through a Decentralized Process Case Study: University of Wisconsin-Stout." Planning for Higher Education 7 (June 1979): 15-18.

Hartman, James B. "Change and Conflict in the University." The Journal of Educational Thought 11 (April 1977): 3-15.

Hipps, G. Melvin, ed. Effective Planned Change Strategies. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 33. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Ingram, E. J. "The Politics of Policy Implementation." Education Canada 18 (Fall 1978): 12-23, 30.

Keller, George. "Shaping the Future of American Higher Education." Unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Higher Education, San Francisco, October 28, 1984.

Lawton, Stephen B. and Lawton, William H. "An Autocatalytic Model for the Diffusion of Educational Innovations." Educational Administration Quarterly 15 (Winter 1979): 19-46.

Mitroff, Ian I. and Kilman, Ralph H. Methodological Approaches to Social Science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Nordvall, Robert C. The Process of Change in Higher Education Institutions. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Reserach Report No. 7, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Organization Study Committee Minutes of February 3, 1984. College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo.

Pirsig, Robert M. Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance. New York: Bantam, 1974.

Report of the Subcommittee on Committee Structures. College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo, March 9, 1984.

Report of the Subcommittee on Organization. College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo, March 9, 1984.

Ryan, Doris W. "Administrative Control in Academic Departments and Response to Reorganization." Administrators Notebook, Vol. 18, No. 7 (March 1970): 1-4.

Survey of the Faculty-Administration Liaison Committee, College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo, November 22, 1983.

Wideen, Marvin F. and Holborn, Patricia. "Program and Organizational Change in Faculties of Education: Some Lessons for Survival." Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1984.

Zaltman, Gerlad, ed. Processes and Phenomena of Social Change. New York: Wiley, 1973.